DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 382 494 SO 024 624

AUTHOR Rohrs, Hermann
TITLE The Pedagogy of Peace as a Central Element in Peace Studies: A Critical Review and an Outlook on the Future. Peace Education Miniprints No. 63.
INSTITUTION School of Education, Malmo (Sweden). Dept. of Educational and Psychological Research.
REPORT NO ISSN-1101-6418
PUB DATE Aug 94
NOTE 31p.
AVAILABLE FROM Department of Educational and Psychological Research, School of Education, Lund University, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conflict; *Conflict Resolution; Curriculum Development; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; Higher Education; *Peace; *Social Studies; Social Values; Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Methods; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

This document discusses peace education not as a subject but as part of the teaching of various academic subjects depending on the extent to which they lend themselves to this. The intention is to produce educational situations where young people can develop skills in the art of peace and a peaceful approach to conflict resolution. The pedagogy of peace is understood here as the sum of scholarly and scientific thinking on the nature of peace education and the way it should be organized. The pedagogy of peace is an interdisciplinary branch of science using a broad range of methods, including observation, description, and analysis of peace-educational processes and interrogation of participants with regard to their motives. There is a strong need for intensified peace-pedagogical research efforts and for documentation and coordination of work in this field. This report reflects an approach in three stages: (1) a discussion of the structure of peace education; (2) an interpretation of the pedagogy of peace in its relationship to peace education (in cooperation with peace studies); and (3) prospects for peace education in developing nations. (DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Peace Education Miniprints
No. 63
August 1994

ED 382 494

THE PEDAGOGY OF PEACE AS A CENTRAL ELEMENT IN PEACE STUDIES: A CRITICAL REVIEW AND AN OUTLOOK ON THE FUTURE

Hermann Röhrs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AKE BJERSTEDT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 024 624

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE PEDAGOGY OF PEACE AS A CENTRAL ELEMENT IN PEACE STUDIES: A CRITICAL REVIEW AND OUTLOOK ON THE FUTURE

Hermann Röhrs

Peace education is not seen as a "subject". It figures more or less prominently in the teaching of various academic subjects depending on the extent to which they lend themselves to this. The intention is to produce educational situations where young people can develop "peace-mindedness", "peace-ability" and "skills in the art of peace". The pedagogy of peace is understood here as the sum of scholarly and scientific thinking on the nature of peace education and the way it should be organized. The pedagogy of peace is an interdisciplinary branch of science using a broad range of methods, including observation, description and analysis of peace-educational processes and interrogation of participants with regard to their motives. There is a strong need for intensified peace-pedagogical research efforts and for documentation and coordination of work in this field.

The title of these remarks – "The Pedagogy of Peace as a Central Element in Peace Studies: A Critical Review and an Outlook on the Future" – reflects an approach in three stages: 1. A discussion of the structure of peace education. 2. An interpretation of the pedagogy of peace in its relationship to peace education (in cooperation with peace studies). 3. Prospects for peace education in the Third World. Mention should be made of the fact that even where this is not expressly stated my remarks will be based to a large degree on the experience derived in the course of the last 20 years from the foundation and organisation of an International Comprehensive School in Heidelberg, expressly designed as a Peace School, and a nursery school in Mannheim based on peace-educational principles (Röhrs, 1975, 1976). Let us begin, then, with an attempt to define what peace education is, a question which in its turn involves asking what it is exactly that we mean by the term "peace".

1.

Peace is a word with a range of meaning that embraces both our lives as individuals and our existence in a society. In each case it can be used to describe both a condition and a "consummation devoutly to be wished" – and worked for. We may perhaps view peace as a striving for self-identity, an "original quality of friendship and charitability" (Kluge, 1960, p.18). Here the idea of "friendship" defines this self-identity in terms of a positive attitude towards one's fellow human beings, while the idea of "charitability" highlights the eschewal of aggression and destructive behaviour. Leaving aside for the moment any major differences of interpretation that may have materialised in the course of the ages, we may safely say that these elements are also fundamental to the terms *shalom*, *eirene*, *pax* and *agape*. In all these manifestations, peace is the expression of a concern to instil humanity in the true sense of the word into our lives and relations – except of course in those instances where human societies have adopted life styles that by their very nature contradict this idea of peace.

While peace has regularly been a guiding ideal in human history, finding manifold expression in philosophy and anthropology, it has only been actually realised in human society in a vague and rudimentary way. From Erasmus of Rotterdam to Rousseau and beyond there has been no shortage of grand political designs seeking to safeguard peace via systems of alliance and *entente*, international peace-keeping forces or supranational tribunals. What they all have in common is the assumption that war is an ever-present eventuality, an

established fact inherent in human nature. Depending on their philosophical allegiances these designs then seek either to limit and humanise war or to dispense with it altogether as a political instrument.

Kant may be seen to occupy an intermediate position on this issue in that he regards Man's progress through history as one of increasing enlightenment and insight, in short as a species of education through history. He develops this idea in his *"Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht"* /"The Study of History as a Grounding in Cosmopolitanism"/, one of the most influential chapters in the history of the peace idea. Kant's cosmopolitan intentions as set out there may be summarised as follows: History teaches Man how to humanise his instinctive behaviour, including the aggressive proclivities that manifest themselves in the brutality of war. History also provides plentiful examples of the ever-present danger of relapsing into such brutality; but each of these regressions has a distinctively educative – and hence corrective – side to it.

The fundamental problem in safeguarding peace is indeed an educational one. Whether we regard warlike attitudes as having their origins in a more primitive natural human condition characterised by the "right to violence" (and still a highly operative feature of organised human aggression despite the legislation that seeks to regulate it), or whether – as the famous UNO dictum so trenchantly puts it – we see it as beginning "in the minds of men", the only way in which we can seriously expect to modify such attitudes in the long term is by education. Politically speaking, the natural consequence of this would be the creation of an open, vigilant society in which national sovereignty is limited and in this limited form largely relinquished in favour of supranational forms of authority.

This design has been rehearsed time and again, from Rousseau's *"Jugement sur la paix perpétuelle"* /"Thoughts on Perpetual Peace"/ and Kant's *"Zum ewigen Frieden"* /"On Everlasting Peace"/ all the way up to the conception of the League of Nations and the work of the United Nations. New in this line of development, albeit adumbrated by Kant, is the conviction that the willingness and the propensity for peace – those conditions upon which the safeguarding of peace in fact rests – can be nurtured by means of education. Peace is not a paradisiacal state conferred upon us as a divined act of grace. In the modern world it must rather be regarded as the invariably uncertain product of constant active engagement with a multiplicity of potential conflicts that can only be controlled via educative and/or self-educative methods. Thus peace education takes its place as an integral feature of the field of education in general, a feature calling not only for practical application but also for

scientific clarification and theoretical self-definition over and against neighbouring disciplines.

The touchstone of our thinking about conflict settlement will indubitably remain the passage in the Bible in which, after various abortive attempts at reconciliation, Abraham proposes to his cousin Lot that they part company peaceably: "Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, my herdmen and thy herdmen: for we be brethren. Is not the whole land before thee? separate thyself, I pray thee, from me: if thou wilt take the left hand then I will go to the right; or if thou depart to the right hand then I will go to the left." Such primal sources of human insight prove to have lost nothing of their original suggestiveness when it comes to pondering such essentially human predicaments as the preservation of peace. In this particular case we have an instance of a "cooling-off treaty" *avant la lettre*, a peaceful resolution of dispute via communication and mutual consent, a form of conflict management that in the international arena has lost none of its significance to this day. Here the Bible once again demonstrates its uniqueness as a repository of wisdom gained and proven in thousands of years of human history.

This brings us of course to a consideration of the opposite of peace – war. For it is war that provides if not the measure then at least the impetus for peace and the educational attitudes which a commitment to peace implies. As Hugo Grotius put it flatly: *"Inter bellum et pacem nihil medium."* Any compromise between the two is not only impossible, it would be actively dangerous. War must be recognised as such, the better to identify it in its clear contradistinction to peace, and hence to banish it. Thus if peace education wishes to evade the accusation of preferring to indulge in rosetinted daydreams of a better world rather than facing up to the hard facts of life then it must take its bearings by addressing the inhumanity of modern warefare head-on and from there explaining what peace can mean in an unpeaceful world and how it can be achieved, preserved and made an organic part of our lives. In the course of doing so it will realise that the strict separation that Hugo Grotius was justified in making in his day is in fact no longer tenable. In a modern world where technological sophistication makes it possible to destroy whole continents by pressing a button and unleashing batteries of nuclear warheads we live in a state of *Frieden-Krieg, guerre-paix*, war-peace that hangs over the inhabitants of all the continents of the Earth as a permanent threat. In the midst of peace we are in constant awareness of potential hostility and destruction.

What can peace education in fact achieve in such a context? By instilling an idea of peace at an early stage it would seem to be a certain way of providing

young people with an informed and acute awareness of the issues at stake and hence making them more likely to favour peaceable solutions in their (later) political options. Yet whether it can in fact do precisely this has been queried time and again. Are not the many reservations entertained about peace education in fact a token of its very ineffectuality? During the foundation of the International Comprehensive School in Heidelberg (as of 1970) and the peace-educational nursery school in Mannheim we repeatedly asked the parents involved for their views. About half of them expressed reservations. One point frequently made was the fear that such an additional "subject" might turn out to be a detrimental factor with regard to the amount of knowledge communicated in other subjects and hence to the academic performance of the pupils.

Another source of unease was the idea that the inculcation of peaceable attitudes could have a debilitating effect on young people's will to self-assertion and their ability to stand up for themselves in group contexts. Only after a number of round-table discussions with the parents (among them many migrant workers) did we register a more favourable attitude towards peace education.

There was full acceptance of two principles underlying our view of the way peace education should be implemented in the actual classroom context:

1. Right down to its fundamental principles peace education is a universally conceptualised form of education. It addresses itself to the whole personality of the individual and to be credible must acquit itself convincingly both in the everyday context of school interaction – between pupils and teachers, pupils and fellow-pupils – and in the interaction between the school and the community.

2. Peace education is not a "subject". It figures more or less prominently in the teaching of the various academic subjects depending on the extent to which they lend themselves to the thematisation of peace. Of particular note here are subjects like the mother tongue, history, civics and foreign languages.

Peace education is not something contingent to education proper. It is a form of education that constantly refers back to its own indispensable premises and objectives. If in a warlike world our intention is to produce a situation where (young) people are *peace-minded*, *peace-able* and *skilled in the arts of peace* then peace education must prepare them for this condition. These three stages need to be properly attuned to one another. *Peace-mindedness*, i.e. the willingness to embrace the ideals of peace, is a state of mind that recognises conflicts for what they are and is prepared to contribute to their resolution, thus consolidating a basis for cooperation. *Peace-ability*,

i.e. the capacity to act in accordance with the peace ideal, is a human qualification enabling the individual to take an active, shaping part in exploiting the potentialities for peace in the social context and by dint of foresight to restrict the dangers to peace stemming from human inadequacies. Being *skilled in the arts of peace*, finally, is in the profoundest sense a characteristic of human circumspection and political maturity. As a form of personal maturity enabling the individual to act in the interests of peace it is the productive sum of the willingness and ability to entertain the ideal of peace, going beyond these in that it also extends to translating such potential factors as peace-mindedness and peace-ability into action. It is thus important for this specific practical skill to be practised and put to the test. It is not a natural gift but the result of planned educational action. And it can only flourish on the basis of a carefully established fund of peace-educational knowledge and experience, elements which are themselves a product of peace-educational endeavour.

In terms of their own essential significance, education and peace are interrelated processes. If it is the goal of education to guide the individual in the discovery of his or her own self by confronting that individual with the world in its essential aspects, then this can only truly be done via the effects of the awareness of peace inculcated via education. Peace awareness means the arousal of conscience and a feeling for the responsibility that the individual has towards the superordinate whole and its fundamental purpose and order.

Thus in its essence peace education is a process of humanisation, a strengthening of the *res humanae*. It is a process of pacification, a coming to terms with oneself in the sense of a self-discovery that leads to self-identity. This anthropological process of liberation that is central to all humanist philosophies is bound up with our perception of Others and the responsibility that we bear for those Others. Peace is a socio-political problem that rests on individual pacification as the realisation of personal identity. The scope of reference is however non-selfcentred in that the attainment of individual self-realisation remains a function of the extent to which it empowers others to achieve the realisation of that same process. Martin Buber's dictum on the dialogic principle – he described it as "going out towards each other" (Röhrs & Meyer, 1979) – reflects perfectly the basic approach represented by peace education. It was an approach that Buber himself attempted to embody in Israel in the relations he entered into with the Arabs. It is a further example of the way in which willingness and ability to act for peace remain the essential yardstick by which we can gauge commitment to peace.

In terms of its anthropological allegiances, peace education is something fundamental establishing a solid foundation for humanisation by means of the

discovery and the encouragement of what is truly human in each and every one of us. Taking peace education seriously in this anthropological sense means engineering a turning-point in the development of humankind by replacing the agonistic phase that has prevailed so far by an era of global peace. During the agonistic phase war was the driving force behind all activities; in the era of global peace responsibility for the safeguarding and shaping of peace in this more precise anthropological sense will be the new global political imperative. This is the only conceivable way in which a moralisation of humankind can take place as ongoing responsibility for others presupposes a high degree of ethical maturity. But to say this is merely to present a perspective – no more.

Such high anthropological ideals can only be aspired to in the course of a life-long process which is all the more effective the earlier it begins. Fröbel's conviction that the first thoughts and actions of a child are decisive for its further development is of profound significance in the peace education context. It will only be possible to usher in an era of peace if peace ideals are inculcated at an early stage, thus establishing the foundation for all that follows. If the global transformation that we are aiming for is to be one that goes beyond mere technological efficiency to galvanise our attitude towards life in such a way as to qualify for the term "renaissance" and to revitalise dormant or submerged potential for the development of genuine humanity, then this process must be initiated in early childhood.

This brings us to the both fundamental and pioneering function of peace education in the school and nursery-school context. Obviously this can only take place in cooperation with the parents; as otherwise dangerous educational non sequiturs may ensue. Indeed, given the universal nature of its task, peace education will have to attempt a critical review of the entire educational framework in which it is called upon to operate – the styles of upbringing subscribed to by parents and school, forms of play, the mass media, everyday life and life in the school community. Seen thus, peace education needs to evolve in stages to achieve the status of a life principle determining a person's entire mode of existence.

Peace education is understood as an empirically oriented objective. The daily conflicts and instances of aggression that a peace-educationally motivated school will of course still have to deal with are much more fruitful as material for experience-related reflection and hence for a critical review of attitudes and behaviour than any amount of well-meant theoretical haranguing on conflict and aggression or rhetorical expatiations on the Idea of Peace. To the extent that it hopes to influence the attitudes, views and actions of individuals,

peace education will always have to begin from a shared assessment of actual instances of behaviour in terms of common and shared norms and standards. The earlier such reflection sets in with a view to reforming our modes of behaviour, the greater the prospect is of actually bringing about changes in attitudes based on insight rather than sanctions.

2.

If peace education is frequently in the line of critical fire, this is no less the case with the pedagogy of peace, understood here as the sum of scholarly and scientific thinking on the nature of peace education and the way it should be organised. Thus we intend to rehearse here the main criticisms levelled at it before attempting to set out how we feel that this area of academic endeavour should be constituted. These reservations are encountered both in the public at large and in the relevant government departments and relate a) to fears of a loss of the ability for self-assertion in the tough world of everyday reality, b) a paralysis of the will to (national) self-defence, and c) doubts about the claims of the pedagogy of peace to the status of a truly academic discipline in its own right.

These reservations have their roots in history. After the Second World War, the re-education and democratisation of the German education system under the auspices of the allied powers left peace education largely out of account (Röhrs, 1993, pp. 44-57). It cannot be entirely ruled out that one of the operative reasons for this (albeit never actually professed) was the fear that in the event of hostilities as a result of the rapidly deteriorating relations between East and West, peace education might weaken and indeed finally undermine altogether the will to fight. The repeated reservations about the value of peace education thus appear to have extremely plausible pragmatic grounds.

Since that time demurrings of this nature – both from the public and from the academic fraternity – have been the order of the day. They were also expressed in the face of the establishment of the Pedagogy of Peace Section of the "German Society of Educational Science". The section was set up in 1986 and has been operating since that time with notable success, as the various publications of its members testify. In 1991, the executive board of the Society decided to deprive the section of its independent status and second it to another section that was prepared to take it under its wing. This decision provoked considerable disagreement. As a founder member of the section I

myself formulated my objections on various occasions, both in spoken and in written form. Perhaps I may be allowed to quote from a letter dated 24 April 1992 and addressed to the then president of the "German Society of Educational Science", Dietrich Benner: "I consider the allocation to another section an extremely problematic act. Are we to assume that the 'German Society of Educational Science', the parent association of academic inquiry into the nature of pedagogy, is not prepared to give peace and its educational grounding a real chance within the framework of the organisation? I am fully cognisant of the arguments marshalled by other disciplines to prove that peace education is something which they already cover to an adequate degree. But the pedagogy of peace is a discipline in its own right, with specific rights of its own that require specific representation."

Elise Boulding reports on the upsurge of interest in peace research after the foundation of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) during the Cold War era. Much less resonance was however accorded to the resolution of a small group of educationists taken during a conference in Bled and urging the constitution of an IPRA Commission on peace education. The proposal was met with almost total rejection among the ranks of IPRA members. According to Elise Boulding the proposal was regarded as a diversion from the actual task of peace research, begging the decisive issue of the nature of war and peace and attempting to reduce complex issues to simple formulas, thus making them palatable for "helpless" children. After a heated debate the commission was grudgingly approved. (Boulding, 1988, p. 5.)

The reception accorded to this proposal is symptomatic of the attitude towards peace education represented by major factions within peace research. According to this view, peace education is the dubious attempt on the part of unworldly educators to simplify the complex and complicated issues at stake in peace studies so as to make them digestible for "babes and sucklings". In the absence of scholarly supervision, such attempts – so it is said – are bound to do more harm than good. This attitude ignores completely the existence of the pedagogy of peace as a (potential) source of scholarly supervision. It is an attitude which, in spite of the ignorance and academic naiveté of its stance, has still not been entirely overcome in the domain of peace studies. The conviction that all attempts on the part of peace studies will remain fruitless as long as we fail to instil into individuals a carefully motivated attitude towards peace that extends to a willingness to undertake action on behalf of peace is unfortunately not one that can be said to be very widespread. And again we must stress that it is a scientifically proven fact that these attempts must begin as early as possible in childhood and be maintained throughout a person's life.

This of course means that the radius of peace education is extremely broad in scope. Its function as an aid and orientation in decision-making for those active in political life – be it at community, party or government level – is only a small sector of the carefully considered safeguarding and shaping of peace based on the findings of peace studies. Without ongoing peace-educational foundation work from below, such a safeguarding of peace is doomed to remain illusory. At the level of governmental and party politics the pursuit of peace is subject to all kinds of unpredictable influences that militate against it and operate in favour of political pragmatism. The only genuinely safeguarding element in this process is the individual citizen endowed with a species of civic awareness committed to peace and stemming from enlightened political judgment. Once this is conceded, it becomes obvious that peace education and the pedagogy of peace have a supremely important role to play, one which at the moment they are by no means in a position to assume but which they urgently have to be made capable of assuming at a global level. With reference to the criticisms mentioned at the beginning of this section, we should add that in 1989 the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), together with the (at the time) highly controversial Peace Education Commission (PEC) were awarded the UNESCO Peace Prize, no doubt a source of considerable gratification for both bodies.

This was without doubt a triumph of genuinely public dimensions. Yet a number of questions still remain unanswered in connection with peace education and the pedagogy of peace. As long as peace education is left to the discretion and initiative of individual teachers without any academically sanctioned curriculum for them to work from, scepticism does indeed seem to be justified. Where such initiatives can draw upon a fund of political and educational knowledge acquired via self-study in the field of peace research they are worthy of every commendation. But if they stem from a more individual "inspirational" attitude on the part of the teacher then they run the risk of becoming merely subjective. What is needed alongside an established peace-educational curriculum is the assurance of corresponding instruction for teachers in the framework of teacher training or further training.

As we can see from this historical run-down of the situation, a clinching definition of peace education and the pedagogy of peace is not a feasible proposition, nor is it likely to become one in the future. The issues involved are too complex and they are highly dependent on the constellations prevalent at any given moment. Despite the striving for objectivity the given political situation and the relative likelihood of war will always colour the definition. The danger of war is a source of apprehension that will invariably give the

call for more armament precedence over considerations about peace. In the last instance, one's view of peace is an ultimately personal matter and it will be influenced in a variety of ways by the genesis of the *persona* in question. For this reason there can only be a descriptive definition which does its best to clarify the dominant components. Expectations of a punchy slogan-like formula will always be doomed to disappointment.

It was under the impression of these insights that we ourselves worked out a definition in the course of a seminar at Heidelberg University in the 70s, together with the Swedish peace educationalist Anatol Pikas and the participating students. As such this definition is a cooperative result based on a supra-national perspective and committed to the important principle of common sense. It runs as follows: "Peace education is an interpersonal and international undertaking designed to achieve the objective 1) of developing peacemindedness, peaceability and skill in preventing destructive conflicts and aggressive behaviour. In addition it attempts 2) to foster awareness of the actual and/or latent processes that lead to such conflicts and to counteract circumstances favouring structural violence. Its purpose is also 3) to encourage attitudes leading to constructive modes of behaviour to the satisfaction of the individuals and groups involved. The principles underlying the communal life style and the specific services required must be established cooperatively in a process of constant exchange of experience and be in accord with the generally held convictions of the society in question and with the principles of justice and tolerance. In the framework of consensus-based activity its aim is further 4) to guarantee the implementation of all justified objectives with a view to achieving global consensus. Seen thus, peace education is 5) an ongoing experiment dimensioned along the parameters of everyday life, human commitment and an international scale of action. Peace education strengthens self-identity but also leads in the final analysis to a supra-individual and supra-national stance and attitude. It places the common weal above egotism, both on the national and international plane." (Röhrs, 1993, p. 95).

Here again, the emphasis is on the inculcation of the ability and active skills required to resolve conflicts and prevent or reduce aggression. Our democratic society has clearly shown how important political awareness is in the responsible administration of the freedom entrusted to us. Of especial importance here is the need to foster the ability to resolve conflicts and prevent or overcome aggression.

Given these very real tasks facing peace education, the time has come to examine the scientific character of the pedagogy of peace and its methods. The

pedagogy of peace is an interdisciplinary branch of science which is dependent on cooperation from other disciplines actively involved with the scientific and scholarly study of peace. Its function is the clarification of peace-educational processes in educational institutions such as schools and nursery schools, as well as in family and public life. Its methodological approach is geared to a pluralistic model that encompasses methods employed both in the humanities and in the empirical sciences. Observation, description and analysis of peace-educational processes and interrogation of participants with regard to their motives are the central pillars of its methodology. This methodology thus stands revealed as a combination of the hermeneutic and the empirical and is rooted in the conviction that these two approaches complement each other. The combined hermeneutic and empirical approach is aimed at a closer understanding and an illumination of reality and ultimately (as a function of this enhancement of our knowledge) at bringing about change or – to put it more precisely – improvement.

Thus the pedagogy of peace is descriptive and analytic in its perspective on peace-educational reality. In collaboration with other academic disciplines inquiring into the issues posed by peace it is able to both reflect and influence societal reality. Elise Boulding's view is in basic harmony with this interpretation when she writes that peace education is the critical interface between research and action (Boulding, 1988, p. 1).

This relationship itself heeds however to be placed in a perspective modified in terms of a distinction that has hardly ever been made throughout the length and breadth of the relevant scholarly literature. As a scientific discipline the task of the pedagogy of peace is to reflect upon peace education as its cognate area of practical activity. As education is a phenomenon that accompanies us throughout our lives, adult life is also open to peace education as a field of study for the pedagogy of peace, thus ensuring it a key function in the broader context of peace studies in general.

Providing that peace education sets in at a sufficiently early stage under the supervision of the pedagogy of peace, it can contribute to the pacification of everyday life by helping to

* recognise and overcome aggression
* address and resolve conflicts
* strengthen cooperative behaviour
* develop peace awareness.

Aggression has become a scourge of humanity the world over. Two thirds of the people convicted for crimes of violence in the Federal Republic of

Germany are under the age of 20. This in itself is an impressive corroboration of the assertion that peace education must begin early – in nursery school, in school, at home.

The prerequisite here is awareness of the state of discussion at the academic level. Empirical studies (Buss, 1972; Lischke, 1972; Kornardt, 1981/1992) have demonstrated that frustration and aggression are not necessarily mutually conditioned. If however from early childhood onwards an individual finds that aggression as an outlet for frustration is successful, then a pathological interdependence can in fact come about. It is thus important for the constructive handling of frustration and aggression to be demonstrated, instilled and hence learned at an early stage. (Röhrs, 1994a, p. 131.)

Another thing that has become apparent is that aggression is not inevitable. It is a product of the social situation and the kind of education that an individual has been exposed to. This in its turn demonstrates that forms of human behaviour are largely the product of a (frequently cross-generational) learning process. There derive from this not only logical consequences but also important provisional conclusions. If an individual is and becomes what he has learnt, the result can never be final or static. Learning involves revising opinions, learning new things; the ongoing learning process is a liberation from constricting forms (in individually different ways). The connection between frustration and aggression is largely acquired in an environment in which the resultant behaviour is both effective and rewarded with approval.

An important element here is the portrayal of violence on television. The ten scenes of violence per hour shown on TV screens in the United States are probably not representative of the general state of things. But they do show how alarming the situation already is. The view that permanent displays of violence involve a brutalisation and hence a considerable lowering of the inhibition threshold among juvenile spectators has convinced many people in positions of authority. The catharsis theory suggesting that contemplation of acts of cruelty has a purifying effect is no longer tenable in the face of increasing violence. Emotional involvement would not appear to take the form of sympathy with the victim based on *curiositas* but rather that of identification with the assailants. Many sceptics on this point were converted by the information from Britain that, just before committing their horrifying crime, the two 10-year-old murderers of little James Bulger had seen a glorification of violence in the form of the video "Child's Play 3". This shows the necessity both of stricter censorship on film material and early peace education for young people.

If this is true then re-orientation and re-motivation and the learning of new attitudes are obviously of central significance in the handling of aggression. In his two-volume documentation on the problem of aggression, Kornadt comes to the conclusion that "the motivation theory of aggression is a step forward" (1992, p. 513). Motivation as part of the learning process thus represents an approach that combines and transcends biological and neuropsychological research on this phenomenon.

Aggression expresses itself in many ways. They are not only physical but can also be more subtle. Mental and psychological cruelty can frequently have more lasting repercussions than a punch in the face. Yet there is a significant distinction to be made between structural violence – i.e. stunting the development of potential – and aggression. Aggression is immediate, individual expression directed at an object. Acts of destruction and vandalism, for example, are invariably aimed at a social group and its representatives. What all forms have in common is the use of violence and a vengeful desire to cause damage. This applies equally to ingeniously channelled forms of social action designed to undermine prestige or systematic character assassination aiming at disrupting existing structures of power and influence (Röhrs, 1994a, p. 132).

In the light of these considerations a primary task facing peace education is that of making all cases of aggression the subject of clarifying verbal exchange. The "offender" must be made to recognise what he has done and understand the motives behind the deed, as a first step towards seeing the error of his ways and making subsequent reparation. In the framework of nursery, primary and secondary school models initiated by the present author, such an exchange will take place at different levels depending on how serious the case of the "offender" in question is (personal biography, effects of deed, character profile). These various levels are

* the group in which the event took place
* the forum of the whole class
* a panel consisting of teacher, social pedagogue and school psychologist.

Of major importance here is the climate in which such an exchange is conducted, openness and understanding being the qualities that are most conducive to good results. The aim is to explore the reasons behind the deed and the motives for it and to convince the "offender" of the one-sidedness, egotistic partiality and personal prejudice involved in what he has done. It is essential to aim at arousing willingness and readiness for reconciliation and active reparation and that the measures designed to bring this about be matched to the structure and the circumstances of the "offence" itself. The

profound insight that such a procedure is planned to convey is that co-operative behaviour on amicable terms with one's fellows is both more satisfying personally and also ultimately more successful at a social level. Integration is the watchword here; aggressors are normally marginal figures and must be incorporated into the group as a whole, one way of doing this being to ensure that they participate in communal tasks.

Such responsible and methodologically demanding educational work requires support at the research level. This support can take the form of testing and of supervision. This in its turn makes the establishment of model institutions necessary, including channels for the transfer of the insights acquired to other institutions. A further desideratum is that these issues be more broadly discussed in disciplines related to peace studies at institutions of higher education and in research institutes specialising in such studies.

Given the very real significance of the pedagogy of peace and its practical counterpart and testing-ground peace education, one question that needs to be looked into is the extent to which higher education institutions have in fact devoted themselves to the scholarly investigation of this particular field of activity, be it at a national or international level. In view of the fact that the importance of this area was recognised at an early stage by the Progressive Education movement and that a correspondingly early call went up for the institutionalisation of some form of scholarly supervision and initiation, the response at university level can only be called muted. Even the traumatic experience of two world wars did little to change the situation. If it had any effect at all it was to step up armament research. Only in isolated cases was there any move to establish peace research – in whatever form – at university level.

Early initiatives in this direction came from the Progressive Education movement (Maria Montessori, Pierre Bovet, Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster, Kurt Hahn) and more specifically from the New Education Fellowship. An instance of these initiatives was the fierce criticism voiced at the Montessori Conference in Copenhagen in connection with the decision on the part of some countries to establish university chairs for the "Science of Defence" over and against the complete and utter absence of any kind of deliberations about establishing corresponding professorships for a "Science of Peace". The most vocal opponent to this development was Elisabeth Rotten, who on the eve of the Second World War addressed a resolution summarising the relevant points to the President of the United Nations with a view to "safeguarding world peace" (Rotten, 1937; Röhrs, 1991, pp. 91-92).

More or less independently of this development the post-war period then

saw the emergence of peace research centres in almost all continents, some of them with sections given over to the pedagogy of peace.

Most of these peace research institutes were established as self-governing bodies independently of the universities. This was most often the case in smaller neutral countries able to regard the war with a degree of critical detachment and quicker to resume normal activities after the war was over. Of particular note here are the research institutes in Scandinavia, now known world-wide under their exotic-sounding acronyms PRIO, SIPRI, PADIGRU and TAPRI.

It is fitting to begin our review with the International Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), founded in 1959 as a department of the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Oslo. In 1966 it was separated off from the university and established as an institute in its own right under the directorship of Johan Galtung. It subsequently resumed its systematic cooperation with individual institutes within the university.

In the last few years research emphasis here has been on "conflict theory and the study of ethnic conflicts", "security and disarmament studies, approaches to enhanced security" (with specific reference to the formation of relations of mutual trust), north-south relations and the interrelation between militarisation and underdevelopment. The research programme is supplemented by a concern with ecological issues worked out in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP). Systematic scholarly communication with an interested world audience is assured via the internationally renowned periodicals "Journal of Peace Research" and "Bulletin of Peace Proposals".

Sweden is an outstanding centre of peace research. In the 1960s peace research departments with full professorships were established at the universities of Uppsala and Gothenburg. The Swedish Peace Research Institute owes its existence to an initiative undertaken by Swedish prime minister Tage Erlander, who arranged for the establishment of the Stockholm International Peace Research Centre (SIPRI) in 1964 to commemorate 150 years of peace in his country. The research programme has five main pillars: 1. European security and arms control. – 2. Military technology and arms export control. – 3. Military expenditure and development. – 4. Chemical and biological warfare. – 5. Arms trade and arms production.

Alongside the Stockholm institute Sweden has other major centres of peace research: the Institute of Peace and Conflict Research at the University of Uppsala and the Peace and Development Research Institute Gothenburg University (PADRIGU), the latter founded in 1973. The emphasis here is on

the relationship between development and peace, with International Relations and Development Studies receiving equal attention within this overall approach. Another institution deserving of mention is the Tampere Peace Research Institute (TAPRI) founded in Tampere (Finland) in 1970. It concentrates its research activities on questions of European security, with special reference to the Nordic and Baltic states.

In Britain, Adam Curle at the University of Bradford was an important initiator of peace studies in 1973 (Curle, 1975). His efforts were taken up by James O'Connell in 1978 in the framework of the School of Peace Studies, established five years earlier with the aid of the Quaker Peace Studies Trust. In 1993 the directorship of the Department of Peace Studies was taken over by Paul Rogers. The two main courses Political Science and Sociology can be studied in combination with geography, human medicine, economics and law, history and psychology. Peace studies is also taught at a number of the colleges of the University of London. At King's College and the London School of Economics and Political Science peace studies represent an extremely fruitful supplement to the broad range of courses on international relations. At the University of Groningen in Holland a peace research institute was established in 1962 by Bert Röling as part of the Faculty of Law. This "polemological" institution concentrates on research into the causes of war, the rationale being that clarification of what leads to war is the necessary prerequisite for the active shaping of peace (Röling, 1971). Its three main research concerns are: 1. Conflicts in the international system. – 2. Armament processes. – 3. Conflict resolution and peace strategies.

Mention must also be made here of the peace universities, the *Université de la Paix* in Namur (Belgium), founded in 1960 and interested mainly in security policy and peace education, and the University for Peace in Costa Rica founded in the framework of the objectives of the United Nations in 1981.

Among the German peace research institutions we may begin with the *Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (HSFK)* (the Hessian Foundation for Research into Peace and Conflict). The impetus for the foundaton of this institution came from the government of the state of Hesse in 1969. The aim is to study conflicts and conflict resolution models on the basis of an analysis of kinds of conflict and the circumstances leading to the outbreak of conflicts. Research concentrates on the following aspects: the dynamics and control of international armament (United States of America, Germany and western Europe) and political psychology/peace education. Research results are made available in the form of research reports and

comprehensive studies in the HSFK's own series of book publications. The important function of political advisorship is covered by the "Reports", which appear several times a year.

A number of other institutes are also active in the field of conflict and peace research – the Institute of Peace and Conflict Research in Hamburg (established 1971), the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Living Conditions in a Scientific-Technical World in Starnberg (established 1970), the Research Institute for Peace Policy in Tübingen (established 1976), the Study Community for Peace Research in Munich (established 1958), the Research Centre of the Protestant Study Community in Heidelberg (established 1958), and the Berghof Foundation for Conflict Research in Berlin (established 1993), the latter concentrating its efforts on ethno-national and socio-cultural conflicts in Europe. Alongside these self-governing institutes largely financed by endowment funds, there are departments of peace and conflict research at the Free University of Berlin and of "International Politics and Peace Research" at the University of Tübingen.

Unlike northern Europe and the United States, the Romance nations have very few peace research institutes to their name. Hence we shall only mention those related in organisation and style to the establishments in other European countries. In Italy the *Forum per i Problemi della Pace e della Guerra* has been operating in Florence since 1984, concentrating its efforts on the encouragement of interdisciplinary inquiry into issues posed by war and peace. In France the *Institut Français de Polémologie* was set up as early as 1945. Like the other institutions mentioned here its interest is focussed on issues connected with the prevention of hostilities. The Soviet Union's Institute of World Economy and International Relations in Moscow was restyled by its members to form the Peace Research Institute Moscow (PRIM) in 1989. In collaboration with scholars from the West this institute does research into peace and armament. In Poland the Polish Council for Peace Research was constituted in 1987 in Warsaw. The Council operates on an interdisciplinary basis, extending its cooperation to representatives from the West. Its journal "Polish Peace Research Studies" is notable for its interest in international dialogue.

The International Peace Research Association (IPRA) is a supra-national body founded in 1964 and assembling researchers and research institutions active at national and international levels. Its aim is to initiate and coordinate research being done in peace studies by means of conferences, information services (the "International Research Newsletter") and the organisation of study and research groups. The Peace Education Commission is a section of

the Association and sets itself the task of examining major international findings in the field of peace pedagogy and where possible initiating new projects.

Of quite outstanding interest is the history of the peace research institutes in the United States. The Research and Development Centres established after the Johnson Act of 1964 (Röhrs, 1972) provide a number of parallels to the evolution of the institutes for peace studies. There are however also important differences. Peace research tends to be financed by hybrid forms of private, government and university sponsorship. Also, the laboratories of the Research Centers have not assumed the crucial liaison function between research and practice that they could in theory provide. It is astonishing that no forms of cross-cooperation appear to be provided for between these two sophisticated research systems although both of them are expressly designed to serve the humanisation of man and society.

With the establishment of the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) began a period of consolidation and coordination in the field of peace research in the United States. With a view to strengthening influence and cooperation, five regional Councils were formed (North and South Atlantic, Midwest, Northland and South Pacific) to arrange conferences and stimulate research work. The beginnings of American peace research date back to the foundation of the Center for Research and Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan during the 1960s. As early as 1948 there was a pioneering study programme that went by the name of Peace Studies Institute and Program for Conflict Resolution at Manchester College, Indiana. This development was notably reinforced by the advent of the World Policy Institute in New York and of the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development (COPRED) at the George Mason University in Fairfax, VA in 1970.

With interest in peace studies, peace research and conflict resolution growing, the constant arrival of new institutes made national coordination a necessity. A number of bodies devote themselves to this task: the Peace Studies Association at the Kansas Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution, Bethel College, North Newton, established in 1987 and combining more than 50 programmes; the Five College Program in Peace and World Security Studies (PAWSS), set up in Amherst in 1982 and linking the colleges Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Hillyoke, Smith and the University of Massachusetts; the Wisconsin Institute for the Study of War, Peace and Global Cooperation, which came into being at the University of Wisconsin in 1985 as a union of 29 colleges and universities in the state of Wisconsin; the Peace Studies Consortium of Ohio which originated at the Center for Peaceful Change, Kent

University, with the aim of cooperative promotion of peace policy initiatives at community level; and finally the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development (COPRED), which started life in 1970 at the Center for Conflict Resolution of the George Mason University in Fairfax. As of 1989 COPRED has a special department running the University Peace Studies Network, specialising in the coordination between some 15 regional networks. Proof that such cooperation can flourish across national boundaries is provided by the International Institute of Peace Education (IIPE), an amalgamation of the Teachers College of the University of Columbia (New York) with the Department of Secondary Education at the University of Alberta in Edmonton (Canada). Worthy of mention is the fact that (like the 1984 North Carolina Center for Peace Education) this institute is one of the few geared primarily to the pedagogy of peace in the sense set out above.

These attempts at a coordination of peace studies are supported by a number of internationally acknowledged journals: the "Journal of Conflict Resolution", edited by the Peace Science Society since 1956; the periodical "Peace and Change. A Journal of Peace Research" issued by COPRED and CPRH since 1975; and "Peace Review. The International Quarterly of World Peace", which first appeared in 1989 (Koppe, 1988, p. 3 et seq.; Wienholtz, 1990, p. 40 et seq.).

In the majority of these institutes the orientation is strongly sociological or politological. Political advisorship and information for the (academic) community are features that, while not necessarily explicitly worded, are still obviously a central factor in the corporate identities of these institutions. The pedagogy of peace is only sparsely represented and then hardly ever to the degree that its importance and research bent would warrant. Almost all the institutes emphasise the interdisciplinary nature of their work. The degree to which this extends to the pedagogy of peace in the true sense of the word is not always easy to identify, even on close inspection of the publications, and this is a deficit which must in conclusion be plainly addressed.

Given the broad scope of peace studies at research institutes such as those discussed above it is doubly necessary to point out that there is no forum organising the exchange of experience gleaned in the practical field of peace education. There are an abundance of teachers and indeed whole schools working along these lines. What experience have they gained, what are the conditions necessary for them to be able to operate? Also there are peace-educational research enterprises affiliated to the education departments of universities in all continents of the world and working on partial aspects of

peace education. There is an urgent, as yet unfulfilled need for a clearing house that would document, coordinate and provide information on the results they have come up with. Important work of this nature is performed by the "peace, environment and education" series, edited by Åke Bjerstedt of the Department of Educational and Psychological Research at the School of Education in Malmö (Sweden). At present this publication also serves as a newsletter for the Peace Education Commission (PEC) of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA).

But there is also a strong need for specifically peace-pedagogical research within the interdisciplinary complexion of the individual research institutes. Under what conditions (conversation therapy, controlled play situations etc.) can aggressive behaviour in children and young people be rechannelled and how permanent are the successes once achieved? How do cooperative methods affect the attitudes of individuals? What is needed here is the development of pupil profiles showing the influence of peace-educational approaches on behaviour and the propensity for action. Such studies are of fundamental importance for the lasting democratisation and pacification of all walks of social life. They are no less important than armament and disarmament studies such as those pursued very extensively at many of the institutes over a number of years. The study and development of peaceable forms of conflict and aggression management – with special emphasis on the rationale for alternative modes of action in the face of violence – are just as essential to school life as to the international arena. Systematic cooperation between peace education, the pedagogy of peace, peace research and peace action in a project based on insights gained in a variety of pilot studies and conducted as a joint research undertaking is an imperative at the present juncture. Doubts and hopes in connection with the intrinsic peace-ability of the human individual are much more easily verified by observation of young individuals at an impressionable stage of their development than in the complex arena of international relations, bedevilled as it is by the constant sabre-rattling of the nations. In principle, however, both these aspects belong together.

3.

One area where world peace policy is faced with a particular challenge is the Third World. The prosperity gradient between North and South will remain a permanent source of threat to world peace unless something is done to allevi-

ate the glaring discrepancies via cooperative development aid, which will by its very nature invariably include educational aid. This makes it all the more remarkable that in the programmes of the peace research institutes (with very few exceptions) these decisive issues figure only very marginally.

But it is not only the widespread and complex phenomenon of poverty that makes the Third World a locus of potential dangers which need to be clearly identified if development aid is to become a constitutive part of peace policy. The first additional danger that needs to be addressed is the nationality problem with the various historical roots that it springs from. Secondly mention must be made of ethnic differences within individual countries, differences which are frequently exacerbated by religious issues. All these sources of conflict have specific dynamics of their own and are only susceptible of stabilisation in terms of the overarching objective of establishing world peace. In most cases these conflicts tend to be regarded as hitherto unfulfilled historical aspirations which can only come to fruition against the background of decolonialisation. Thus it is of fundamental importance from the outset for the superordinate and universally obligatory aspect of a new world order to form the leitmotif and serve as a foundation for lasting world peace. The conviction that in the framework of this global peace process the Third World represents a cardinal factor is one that must be encouraged to establish itself as a guiding perspective in those countries themselves.

World peace can only become a more likely proposition via the resolution of socio-political problems on an international plane and trustful cooperation between rich and poor countries. It cannot be achieved through an accumulation of arms stockpiles in the interests of something masquerading as national security. On the contrary: the reallocation of national resources away from armament and towards education is urgently required, as is reflected in the World Declaration of the World Conference on Education for All in Yomtien in 1990, which calls for "a transfer from military to educational expenditure" (World Declaration 1990, p. 8). In addition, partnership and cooperation need to be enhanced at regional, national and international levels. In an era of global domestic policy, national and international security are so closely interlinked that the neglect of any one of these principles can very quickly jeopardise the entire development. Only by means of negotiation, the build-up of trust and aid programmes geared to fostering the principle of self-help can a world-spanning form of solidarity evolve that has a stabilising effect in times of crisis.

The connections between development, development aid and peace have

frequently been referred to, a particularly trenchant formulation being enshrined in the "World Declaration on Education for All" issued at the World Conference in Yomtien in 1990. Article 1 of the Declaration already maps out the fundamental requirement: "to be tolerant towards social, political and religious systems which differ from their own, ensuring that commonly accepted humanistic values and human rights are upheld, and to work for international peace and solidarity in an interdependent world" (World Conference on Education for All: World Declaration, Yomtien 1990, p. 3). Here too we find the conviction expressed that differences (as causes of war) can be overcome in stages (ideally in the framework of development efforts): "Today there is genuine progress towards peaceful detente and greater cooperation among nations" (2).

Relapses cannot be ruled out but hope is placed in "our new capacity to communicate" and hence in greater tolerance. The aim is seen to be a "world community" (8) sustained by regional and international cooperation in the service of just solutions of global problems. In this ongoing process of heightening our general awareness, school and adult education must be allotted a central role, able as they are to contribute fundamentally to the changes in attitude necessary. Here it is first of all important for schools to demonstrate by example how conflicts can be resolved rationally through dialogue and by eschewing the use of violence. This spirit of communication must then penetrate into the surrounding community and prove itself in the face of the conflict potential inherent in everyday communal life. But supranational cooperation in solving common pedagogical problems between countries in the same region can also be the ultimate goal, as in the Sahel Zone, one of the world's major poverty belts (World Conference on Education for All: Background Document. Yomtien 1990, p. 2). A similar instance is the cooperation between the Caribbean islands of Trinidad and Tobago in the framework of a project on infant education and adult education. The programmes are not only elaborated and implemented jointly on the basis of an exchange of experience, they are also to be placed under joint scholarly supervision (World Conference on Education for All: Background Document. Yomtien 1990, p. 74).

Yet the question remains: Peace education in the Third World – isn't that tantamount to distracting from hunger and misery by importing social luxuries? Isn't it just a way of foisting off onto the poorest societies a task that the rich countries themselves have never come to grips with? The example of Costa Rica is at all events an eloquent example of the way in which forgoing military potential can optimise the build-up of the education system. This by

no means banishes the threat from neighbouring states bristling with sophisticated weaponry, as the many cruel wars in the Third World demonstrate. But it is a convincing start that should be emulated in the First and the Third World. It is a sign that human welfare is being placed above ambitions of military power, thus giving reason and common sense the kind of chance that can really only be fully capitalised upon in a unified world.

Despite the many setbacks in development policy, there is growing conviction in both the industrial and the developing countries that development and peace are interdependent. The resumptions of hostility – in the Sudan, Ethiopia, Somalia, Afghanistan, Uganda, Liberia or the Gulf – are graphic illustrations of the way in which such relapses lead those involved to the very brink of human and economic ruin. Development is bound up with the proliferation and safeguarding of humane forms of communal life. The human and economic sides of the development process are organically intertwined and both in their turn are dependent on peace.

These connections have rarely been so convincingly discerned or so trenchantly couched in terms of their significance for development policy as in the "World Declaration on Education for All" in Yomtien in 1990. Early on in the Background Document we find the following passage: "Global movements towards peace, the dramatic reduction in cold war tensions and the positive aggregate growth patterns in many countries in recent years combine to create a more cooperative and committed international climate in support of *human development*, which views the well-being of all humans as the focus and purpose of societal development efforts" (World Conference on Education for All: Background Document, Yomtien 1990, p. 1).

After three decades of development effort and the insights gleaned in that period, investment in "human resources", as the economics of education has it, is regarded universally as the prerequisite for economic development. Only via the activation of human potential can there be prospects of a development oriented towards humanity and its well-being. An integral part of this well-being is Nature as the basis of the world we live in, so that concern for the environment is bound to be an important part of any development policy geared to the safeguarding of peace (Röhrs, 1992, pp. 173-178). Ecology must in future become a central element in the pedagogy of peace (Calließ & Lob, 1987, 1988). In addition it is of prime importance to establish a fully fledged peace research institute in a typical Third World country to look into the requirements of that particular region and to demonstrate in real political – and not just symbolic – terms the essential significance of the shaping and

safeguarding of peace in this important area of the world.

South Africa, Sudan and Somalia, former Yugoslavia and Ireland – none of these are an excuse for embarrassed silence. There too the call for peace education must be voiced with all possible vehemence, albeit with constant awareness of the appalling experiences that the people living in those areas have undergone. The foundation of development is and remains peace. Hence education in the preservation and active shaping of peace must become an essential element in education programmes both at school and at the adult education level. Only in this way can a gradual change of awareness be instituted regarding peace and not war as the constant that needs to be preserved and safeguarded. Thus, among the model institutions to be set up in the Third World at least one in each case should devote itself to an emphasis on peace education issues in order to test procedures and methods for a broader pedagogical public and provide stimuli for ongoing discussion.

Only when there is no region of this world left where the agonistic attitude reigns untrammelled can there be any real hope of lasting peace. Peace-mindedness and the will to peace are decisively supported by spiritual and moral forces that are constantly being undermined by the news reaching us every day about the cruelties of war. Only the experience of a world unified in peace can give us the foundation we need for solidarity in and for peace.

Note: The text above was presented as a lecture at the International Conference "Ricerca e innovazione nel processi formativi", Rome, March 11, 1994.

Literature

AFB-Info 2/87. – *AFB-Info* 2/90. – *AFB-Info* 2/92. (Newsletter of the Information Unit Peace Research. Bonn.)

Bjerstedt, Å. *Conceptions of the future and education for responsibility.* Malmö: School of Education, 1992

Boulding, E. *Friedenserziehung als Friedensgestaltung.* /Peace education and the shaping of peace./ AFB Texts. Bonn: Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung, 1988.

Burns, R. & Aspeslagh, R. "Objectivity", values and opinions in the transmission of knowledge for peace. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 1984, *15*(2), 139-148.

Buss, A.H. Die Quittung der Aggression. /The cost of aggression./ In: Singer, 1972. Pp. 20-31.

Calließ, J. & Lob, R.E. (Eds.) *Praxis der Umwelt- und Friedenserziehung.* /The practice of environment and peace education./ Vol. 1, Vol. 2. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1987, 1988.

Curle, A. *The scope and dilemma of peace studies.* Bradford: Bradford University, School of Peace Studies, 1975.

Heitkämper, P. *Friedenersziehung als Lernprozeß.* /Peace education as a learning process./ Bad Heilbrunn/Oberbayern:Klinkhardt, 1976.

Heitkämper, P. & Huschkle-Rhein, R. (Eds.) *Allgemeinbildung im Atomzeitalter.* /General education in the nuclear age./ Weinheim: Beltz, 1986.

Kluge, F. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache.* (18. Aufl.) Berlin: de Gruyter, 1960.

Koppe, K.-H. *Frieden in Forschung und Lehre an amerikanischen Hochschulen.* /Peace in research and teaching at American universities./ Bonn: Arbeitstelle Friedensforschung, 1988.

Kornadt, H.-J. (Ed.) *Aggression und Frustration als psychologisches Problem.* /Aggression and frustration as a psychological problem./ Two vols. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981/1992.

Lischke, G. *Aggression und Aggressionsbewältigung.* /Getting to grips with aggression./ Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1972.

Richards, E. *Friedenserziehung in der Diskussion.* /Peace education under discussion./ Bonn: Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung, 1984.

Röhrs, H. *Modelle der Schul- und Erziehungsforschung in den USA.* /Models for research into schooling and education in the United States./ Wiesbaden: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1972.

Röhrs, H. *Educazione alla Pace.* /Education for peace./ Brescia: Editrice la Scuola, 1974.

Röhrs, H. *Die Friedenspädagogik im Modell der Internationalen Gesamtschule.* /The pedagogy of peace in the International comprehensive school model./ Hanover, Dortmund, Darmstadt, Berlin, 1975.

Röhrs, H. *Kindergarten, Vorschule, Elternhaus in Kooperation.* /Nursery school, pre-school and home background in cooperation./ Munich, Basle, 1976.

Röhrs, H. Education for peace: A neglected aspect of re-education in Germany. *Oxford Review of Education*, 1989, *15*(2), 147-164.

Röhrs, H. *Die Reformpädagogik und ihre Perspektiven für eine Bildungsreform.* /Progressive education and prospects of educational reform./ Donauwörth: Verlag Auer, 1991, 86-114.

Röhrs, H. *Die Einheit Europas und die Sicherung des Weltfriedens.* /The unity of Europe and the safeguarding of world peace./ Frankfurt/M., Berne, Berlin, New York, Paris, Vienna: Lang Verlag, 1992.

Röhrs, H. *Gesammelte Schriften.* /Collected works./ *Vol. 4. Idee und Realität der Friedenspädagogik.* /The pedagogy of peace – Ideal and reality./ Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag, 1994. (a)

Röhrs, H. *Gesammelte Schriften.* /Collected works./ *Vol. 8. Modelle der Friedenserziehung in Kindergarten und Schule.* /Peace education models in school and nursery school./ Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag, 1994. (b)

Röhrs, H. & Meyer, E. Die pädagogische Ideen Martin Bubers. /Martin Buber's educational ideas./ Wiesbaden: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1979.

Röling, B. *Krieg ist kein Schicksal.* /War is not fated on us./ (2nd ed.) Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971.

Rotten, E. The international peace campaign. *The New Era*, 1936, *17*, 279-280.

Schnaitmann, G.W. *Der Friedensbegriff aus der Sicht von Schülern.* /The concept of peace from a schoolchildren's viewpoint./ Frankfurt/M., Berne, New York, Paris: Lang Verlag, 1991.

Singer, J.L. (Ed.) *Steuerung von Aggression und Gewalt.* /Controlling aggression and violence./ Frankfurt/M.: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1972.

Wienholz, H. *Organisation von Friedensforschung im Vergleich.* /The organisation of peace research – a comparison./ Bonn: Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung, 1990.

World Conference on Education for All: World Declaration on Education for All. New York: UNICEF House, 1990.

"Peace Education Miniprints" are published and distributed by the R&D Group "Preparedness for Peace" (address: School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden).

At present "Peace Education Miniprints" will also function as aids in the networking activities of PEC/IPRA (the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association).

ISSN 1101-6418